

State Executive Council for the Comprehensive Services Act

Topics for Stakeholder Input to Inform Strategic Planning

TOPIC I

In FY2011 \$14,464,225 million was available statewide to fund services for youth in the population considered to be “non-mandated” under the CSA. Only 56% of localities across the state protected and utilized funds in FY2011 for this non-mandated population, expending only 44% of the total funds available for this population – diverting \$8,000,000 away from the non-mandated population to fund services to youth who are mandated for services. Over the past ten years, localities have averaged utilizing less than 57% of available non-mandated funds each year for youth in the non-mandated population. At the same time there is statewide concern about youth with mental/behavioral health needs – youth who are included in CSA’s target population - who “fall through the cracks” and fail to receive the services they need.

- What are the variables that contribute to locality decisions against protecting and utilizing funds for the non-mandated population?
- Should funding for youth in the non-mandated population be preserved?
- What strategies, if any, might the SEC implement to ensure that youth with significant mental/behavioral health needs across the state have access to services and CSA funding?

TOPIC II

Despite the enactment of CSA nearly 20 years ago, there remain many localities who report a lack of cooperation and collaboration across the human service agencies, disengagement of agency partners, and continued silos of thought and protection of agency resources. In contrast, there are localities who report great success in collaborative planning, partner engagement, and creativity in serving youth and families.

1. The impact of juvenile judges on local CSA implementation is frequently cited in discussion about local success. Communities reporting success often cite the proactive involvement of judges with agency partners through initiatives such as best practice courts. Communities who struggle often cite judicial orders that do not support the principles of CSA and do not respect local multi-agency planning and recommendations of family assessment and planning teams.
 - What is the importance of juvenile judge commitment to the principles of CSA and involvement with community planning?
 - What strategies, if any, might the SEC implement to ensure statewide engagement of juvenile judges in local implementation of the CSA?
2. A lack of engagement of public schools in local CSA planning has been frequently cited as an issue. The inclusion of private special education services within the CSA funding structure is

often reported as problematic due to a lack of CPMT control over federal mandates (e.g., IEP services) and the independence of school budgets from local government budgets. Conversely, other local governments cite strong engagement by public schools, positive impacts of full community ownership of every youth, and the effectiveness of executive level strategic planning for service development and agency budgeting.

- What is the importance of including public schools as a partner in CSA for youth requiring private special education services?
 - What is the importance of including public schools as a partner in CSA for youth who are not eligible for special education but who are eligible for CSA as non-mandated youth?
 - What strategies, if any, might the SEC implement to address concerns regarding the inclusion of private special education services within CSA?
3. A local organizational structure in which CSA administration is placed under the control of the local social service agency has been cited as a barrier to interagency collaboration. Leadership and commitment to interagency collaboration “from the top,” i.e., from local government administrators, is often cited as key to a community’s successful implementation of the CSA.
- What is the importance of the local government administration’s understanding, commitment, and leadership to successful implementation of the CSA?
 - How does local organizational structure for CSA administration impact successful implementation of the CSA?
 - What strategies, if any, might the SEC implement to ensure successful administration of the CSA across the Commonwealth?

TOPIC III

The inability of local communities, particularly small rural communities, to develop new services, to address unique community needs, and to successfully collaborate and negotiate with private providers are often cited as significant barriers to implementing the CSA.

- What strategies, if any, might the SEC implement to ensure the availability of services across the Commonwealth?
- What strategies, if any, might the SEC implement to enable communities to develop services and partner with private providers?

PLEASE VISIT THE FOLLOWING SITE TO PROVIDE INPUT

<https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/CSAStrategicPlan>